

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Official Action mailed **November 13, 2003** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-10, 13-22, and 25-33. Claim 1 was objected to because of the following informalities: The phrase of, “to go through a time-consuming process of setting up a new,” on page 3 of the “Amendments to the Claims,” appears to be typographically repeated on page 4. Claims 1, 13, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-5, 9, 13-17, 21, and 25-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Devarakonda et al. (USPN 6,424,992, hereinafter “Devarakonda”) in view of Courts et al. (USPN 6,085,220, hereinafter “Courts”). Claims 6, 7, 10, 18, 19, 22, 30, 31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Devarakonda in view of Courts in further view of Fielder et al. (USPN 6,105,133, hereinafter “Fielder”). Claims 8, 20, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Devarakonda in view of Courts in further view of Kennedy et al (USPN 6,135,582, hereinafter “Kennedy”).

Objections to Claim 1

Claim 1 was objected to because of the following informalities: The phrase of, “to go through a time-consuming process of setting up a new,” on page 3 of the “Amendments to the Claims,” appears to be typographically repeated on page 4.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to remove the typographical error.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 1, 13, and 25 were rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13, and 25 to remove the objectionable matter.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 13, and 25 were rejected as being anticipated by Devarakonda in view of Courts. Applicant respectfully points out that while Devarakonda recognizes the problem solved by the present invention (see Devarakonda, col. 3, lines 43-47), Devarakonda teaches away from the solution of the present invention. In particular, see Devarakonda, col. 5, lines 23-27 which discusses "...**renegotiating a new key.**"

In contrast, the present invention is directed to using an **existing communication session** from another server for the secure communication session with the second client (see page 12, lines 20-27 of the instant application). In this way, the present invention does not have to renegotiate a new key. Thus, the present invention eliminates the excessive time involved in establishing a new secure communication session (see page 9, lines 15-18 of the instant application).

There is nothing within Devarakonda or Courts, either separately or in concert, which suggests using an existing communication session from another server for the secure communication session with the second client. Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13, and 15 to clarify that the present invention uses an existing communication session from another server for the secure communication session with the second client. These amendments find support on page 12, lines 20-27 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, and 25 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 14-22, which depend upon claim 13, and claims 26-33, which depend upon claim 25, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Edward J. Grundler
Reg. No. 47,615

Date: February 6, 2004

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665